How to obtain the Schwarzschild metric before Einstein's field equations

Klaus Kassner
Institut für Theoretische Physik,
Otto-von-Guericke-Universität Magdeburg, Germany
(Dated: April 22, 2016)

As is well-known, there is no way to derive the Schwarzschild metric on the basis of pre-general-relativistic physics *alone*, which means using only special relativity, the Einstein equivalence principle and the Newtonian limit. It is however possible to encode the additional physics needed in two reasonably plausible postulates allowing to deduce the exact Schwarzschild metric without invoking Einstein's field equations. Since these requirements are designed to apply to the spherically symmetric case, their union is much less powerful than the postulates from which Einstein obtained his field equations. It is shown that the field equations imply the postulates given here but that the converse is not quite true. The approach provides a fairly fast calculation method for the Schwarzschild metric in arbitrary coordinates exhibiting stationarity.

PACS numbers: 04.20.-q; 04.20.Cv; 01.40.gb;
Keywords: Schwarzschild metric, general relativity

arXiv:1602.08309v2 [gr-qc] 22 Apr 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Newton's universal law of gravitation,[1] describing the attractive force between two point masses, was found long before its generalization to arbitrary mass densities via the divergence theorem[2] and irrotationality of the gravitational field. Coulomb's law giving the force between two point charges[3,4] was presented well before its field-theoretic foundation through the Poisson equation.[5] With general relativity, the historical sequence was reverted. Einstein first gave the field equations,[6] i.e., the general law, encompassing the most complicated cases, and only then the simple case of a point mass was obtained.[7,8] Could it have been the other way round?

Clearly, the Schwarzschild metric is more difficult to infer than either Newton's or Coulomb's law. Moreover, knowledge of the law for point objects before the field equations would not have been as useful as in the predecessor theories. Whereas these have linear field equations and hence the general law may be constructed from the special one, a similar feat is difficult to imagine in Einstein's theory. The field equations of general relativity are nonlinear.

Nevertheless, the simple form of the Schwarzschild metric in standard coordinates and in particular the fact that its diagonal time and radial components, g_{tt} and g_{rr}, are inversely proportional to each other has led to a variety of attempts at obtaining the metric without reference to, and, the idea is probably not too far-fetched, without much understanding of, the field equations.

It is certainly not overstated to say that the aforementioned inverse proportionality of metric coefficients has been a source of continuing interest and confusion. Although it is well understood under which circumstances the relationship $g_{tt}g_{rr} = -1$ arises,[9] erroneous attributions of this feature to special relativistic effects may be found even in the recent literature.[10–12] Typically, the reciprocity of time dilation and length contraction is invoked, which is *not* responsible for the property. This kind of argument goes back to Lenz and Schiff.[13,14] The latter tried to show that not only gravitational redshift but also light deflection by the sun could be quantitatively accounted for by use of special relativity (SR), the Einstein equivalence principle (EP), the Newtonian limit (NL), and nothing more. The anomalous perihelion precession of Mercury would then be the only classical test of general relativity that really probes the field equations.

In the same year when Schiff's paper appeared, an article by Schild[15] demonstrated that in order to obtain the first-order coefficient in an expansion of g_{rr} in powers of the (normally small) quantity GM/rc^2, more than the three ingredients SR, EP and NL are needed, which is sufficient to falsify Schiff's claim.[16]

As an aside, to obtain the generally relativistic equations of motion in a *given* metric, even the first two of these three ingredients are fully sufficient. If general relativity consists of two parts, one dealing with the way of spacetime telling energy how to move and the other with the way of energy telling spacetime how to curve, essentially half of the theory (the first part) is obtainable from SR and the EP. To expect the other half to arise from mere addition of the NL would be disproportionate.

In fact, as I have shown elsewhere,[17] using a Newtonian approximation to the potential, the exact Schwarzschild metric obtains in a simple "derivation" due to a cancellation of two errors. Therefore, it is not sufficient to get the right answer in a claim to rigor, the correctness of intermediate steps must be verified, too. In strong fields, deviations from Newton's law, expressible as higher powers of GM/rc^2, have to be expected. The assumption that all of these are zero is unjustified, even though it may be true by accident that a particular metric function is already given exactly by the first-order expansion.

At the time of their inception, the field equations constituted a *new law of nature*, going beyond, and not included in, the combination of the EP (including SR) with the Newtonian limit. So they cannot be derivable frome this combination. There are alternative theories of gravity, such as the Brans-Dicke (BD) theory,[18] with *different* field equations and the *same* Newtonian limit, and with spherically symmetric solutions different from the

Schwarzschild one. Since all three ingredients, SR, EP, and NL are contained in the BD theory, it is logically impossible to derive the Schwarzschild solution from these constituents *only*.

Sacks and Ball as well as Rindler pointed out the failure of Schiff's argument with different lines of reasoning.[19,20] Rindler's argument proceeded via a counterexample, based on a static metric, going by his name nowadays,[21] that describes a set of observers each having constant (in time) proper acceleration.

More recently, the subject of simple derivations of the Schwarzschild metric was resumed by Gruber et al.[22] They gave detailed arguments why such a derivation should be impossible. From their analysis, it becomes clear that by *simple* they mean that only the mentioned ingredients SR, NL and EP are used. With this restriction to the meaning of *simple*, they prove their point.

Even if we completely concur with Ref. 22, it would be premature to conclude that one cannot do without the *field equations*.

Basically, either the field equations or their generating action are a set of *postulates* within GR. However, typically, postulates or axioms are *not unique*. In thermodynamics, we have different formulations of the second law, a postulate of the theory. It is sufficient to require one of them, then the others are derivable as theorems. We do not rack our brains about this fact, because the different forms of the second law have similar complexity and are easily shown to be equivalent. Things are much more thorny in set theory, where the axiom of choice, Zorn's Lemma and the well-ordering theorem are all interchangeable. Again, it suffices to postulate one of them to make the other two derivable, but their plausibility levels as axioms seem very distinct, ranging from almost self-understood (the axiom of choice) to outright difficult to believe (the well-ordering theorem).

Returning to general relativity, if consideration is restricted to the stationary spherically symmetric case, it may be possible to employ a simpler set of postulates to deduce a metric than the ones leading to the field equations. There is no need that the postulates be powerful enough to replace the field equations altogether. It is sufficient, if they can replace them in spherically symmetric situations.[23] This kind of approach is not only logically possible, it has even been discussed favorably by Sacks and Ball[19] with regard to Tangherlini's postulational approach to the Schwarzschild metric.[24] Unfortunately, Rindler later showed one of the two Tangherlini postulates to be unconvincing.[25] But clearly, Tangherlini's approach is not subject to the criticism (nor the impossibility proof) offered by Gruber *et al.*[22]

It must be admitted that Rindler's refutation of Tangherlini's argument is less convincing than his rebuttal of Schiff's reasoning. However, Tangherlini's argument may be criticized on the simple grounds that it is coordinate dependent: he equates a coordinate acceleration with a "Newtonian acceleration" without clarifying what makes his coordinate so special that this identification is possible, whereas it is not for other coordinates. And while his choice of radial coordinate may seem plausible in the case of the Schwarzschild metric, the coordinate choice needed to make the postulate work with the Rindler metric looks highly implausible.[25] Similar arguments can be raised against a proposition by Dadhich,[26] in which he suggests that a photon on a radial trajectory cannot be accelerated: $\mathrm{d}^2r/\mathrm{d}\lambda^2 = 0$ in terms of an affine time parameter λ, from which he concludes $g_{tt}g_{rr} = -1$. This is true for the radial coordinate of the standard form of the Schwarzschild metric, because that coordinate is an affine parameter itself,[9] but not for all conceivable radial coordinates. For example, photons on radial trajectories *are* accelerated in affine time, if the radial coordinate of the *isotropic* form of the Schwarzschild metric is taken instead of the standard coordinate r. So any postulate based on independence of coordinate acceleration of the energy of the particle (Tangherlini) or absence of coordinate acceleration for photons (Dadhich) should contain an argument, why it is the particular radial coordinate considered that has this property – of course, without recourse to the field equations, from which the metric and the property could be derived.

Note that if *simple* is taken to just mean *technically simple*, there are ways to obtain the Schwarzschild metric with little effort, as has been shown by Deser.[27] His approach is based on the field equations and requires both understanding and control of sophisticated mathematical tools. Whoever masters these is likely to have followed through the tedious standard derivation before.

The purpose of this paper is to obtain the vacuum metric about a spherically symmetric mass distribution without reference to Einstein's field equations. Due to the existing impossibility arguments,[15,22] it will be necessary to invoke two new postulates and it will be argued that they are sufficiently self-evident to be required prior to any knowledge of the field equations. They are stated here already, so the reader may reflect on their plausibility before their mathematical formulation is given.

The first postulate (P1) says that the force field due to gravity is source free in vacuum. If we have a global description of the force field, this implies that its flux through concentric spherical shells about the center of symmetry must be constant, as long as no matter is located between two such shells. A local formulation will be given in Sec. III.

The second postulate (P2) requires concentric spherical waves of arbitrary temporal wave form to exist, as solutions of the vacuum wave equation, that preserve their shape on propagation in freely falling spherically symmetric frames of reference. These frames are not inertial, as they are local only in the temporal and radial directions but global by encompassing a full spherical shell about the center of gravity. Why we should expect this postulate, closely connected with Huygens' principle, to hold will be discussed in some detail below.

Note that both postulates are physical rather than geometrical, so the geometrical nature of the theory follows solely from its describing gravity by a metric field, not from the use of sophisticated geometric concepts such as

the Riemann tensor.

Naturally, these postulates are derivable from the field equations as will be shown in Sec. IV. While this derivation proves their truth (at least if we believe in general relativity), it should not be necessary when requiring them in the process of building a simplified description of gravity for spherically symmetric mass distributions.

As to the utility of the approach presented, it might be helpful in teaching general relativity. It has been argued[28] that a *physics first* approach, exploring the physical consequences of some given metric before the field equations, would lead to increased interest in, and deeper understanding of, general relativistic phenomena, and enhance the motivation to face the mathematical difficulties of the field equations later. The Schwarzschild metric provides a good example for a nontrivial geometry, permitting the discussion of the four classical tests of general relativity and of the properties of non-rotating black holes. A problem with the approach is then that the metric is pulled out of the hat. It would be much more motivating to be able to justify it in a simple way.

Moreover, the two postulates needed to obtain the vacuum metric for the spherically symmetric problem shed light on certain properties of the Schwarzschild solution, having to do with spacetime curvature. One of these properties seems to be pretty familiar, whereas the author has not seen the other in the literature so far. For readers who feel that no new approach is *needed* to obtain the Schwarzschild metric, because the field equations say it all, the main purpose of the paper may be seen in its discussing interesting properties of the metric that hitherto have not found much attention, if any.

Besides P1 and P2, the three ingredients SR, EP, and NL will all be used in the following deductions. Special relativity is inherent in our starting point that consists in writing down the metric of a pseudo-Riemannian manifold with the same signature as the Minkowski metric. Since we use the Einstein form of the equivalence principle stating that the outcome of non-gravitational experiments in sufficiently local freely falling systems is independent of either the velocity or the (spatiotemporal) position of the laboratory, which means that these experiments are governed by the laws of special relativity,[29] SR is also ingrained in the EP.[30] The Newtonian limit is typically used in determining the asymptotic behavior of the metric at infinity.

Special relativity is also prominent in motivating some ideas by reference to the metric of a rigidly accelerating frame. This is the Rindler metric. A few facts about it are collected in Sec. II. They are fully derivable within SR, but derivations will only be given for some less well-known properties. Section III contains the central result of the paper and Sec. IV establishes the connection of the two postulatees with the field equations. In Sec. V, some conclusions are given. Three appendices discuss how to apply the postulates to three different coordinate systems, yielding alternative forms of the Schwarzschild metric.

II. THE RINDLER METRIC

The Rindler metric may be obtained from the Minkowski metric

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -c^2\mathrm{d}T^2 + \mathrm{d}X^2 + \mathrm{d}Y^2 + \mathrm{d}Z^2 \tag{1}$$

by a coordinate transformation

$$\begin{aligned} cT &= x\sinh\frac{\bar{g}}{c}t\,, \qquad & X &= x\cosh\frac{\bar{g}}{c}t\,,\\ Y &= y\,, & Z &= z\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

and reads

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}s^2 &= g_{ij}\mathrm{d}x^i\mathrm{d}x^j = -f(x)\,c^2\mathrm{d}t^2 + \mathrm{d}x^2 + \mathrm{d}y^2 + \mathrm{d}z^2\,,\\ f(x) &= \frac{\bar{g}^2x^2}{c^4}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where we have adopted, and will use from now on, Einstein's summation convention. The Rindler metric is the form of the Minkowski spacetime adapted to the description of a set of linearly accelerated observers, each of which is subject to constant proper acceleration.[31] $\bar{g}$ is the proper acceleration of the observer at position x_0, where $f(x_0) = 1$. The ensemble of observers perform Born rigid motion, i.e., in the frame of each observer[32] the distance to any other observer of the set remains constant. As a consequence, observers at different x positions experience different proper accelerations a:

$$a = \frac{c^2}{x}\,. \tag{4}$$

We may introduce an acceleration potential Φ, requiring $a(x) = \mathrm{d}\Phi/\mathrm{d}x$, which can be immediately integrated:

$$\Phi(x) = c^2\ln\frac{x}{x_0}\,. \tag{5}$$

The constant of integration has been chosen so that

$$f(x) = \mathrm{e}^{2\Phi/c^2}\,, \tag{6}$$

i.e., the prefactor of the exponential is one. The proper time τ of a coordinate stationary observer (CSO) at position x is related to the global time t by

$$\mathrm{d}\tau = \sqrt{f(x)}\,\mathrm{d}t = \frac{\bar{g}x}{c^2}\,\mathrm{d}t\,. \tag{7}$$

Next, we try to characterize the *force* field resulting from the acceleration of the Rindler frame. Suppose an observer at a fixed position x_O wishes to measure this field, perceived by him and his fellow observers as gravity. To obtain the force at distant positions, he slowly lowers or raises a test mass m, fastened to the end of a massless rigid pole, in the field and determines how strong the mass will pull against, or push down, the pole at its end. For a finite accuracy of the measurement, we need only approximate rigidity and masslessness, which are compatible with relativity, so the experiment is feasible in principle.[17]

The resulting force can be calculated using energy conservation. If the pole is shifted down or up by a piece $\mathrm{d}\ell$ at its near end, the far end will move down or up by the same amount $\mathrm{d}\ell$ in terms of the local proper length. On being lowered, the mass is doing work, on being raised, work must be done on it, so if its energy in the field is $E(x)$, the force exerted by it will be

$$F = -\frac{\mathrm{d}E(x)}{\mathrm{d}\ell} = -\frac{\mathrm{d}E(x)}{\mathrm{d}x}\,. \tag{8}$$

Now locally, the mass always has the energy mc^2, as it does not acquire kinetic energy – the experiment is performed quasistatically. But the observer at x_O will not assign this local value to its energy, because to him everything at x happens at a slower or higher rate due to time dilation. This changes the energy of photons by the time dilation factor. Clearly, all other energies must be affected the same way, otherwise we would run into problems with energy conservation.[33] This leads to

$$E(x) = \sqrt{\frac{f(x)}{f(x_O)}}\,mc^2\,, \tag{9}$$

hence

$$F(x) = -mc^2\frac{f'(x)}{2\sqrt{f(x_O)}\sqrt{f(x)}}\,, \tag{10}$$

which evaluates to $F = -m\bar{g}/\sqrt{f(x_O)}$, i.e., the force is *constant* in space, a fact that has been noted by Grøn before.[34] It is in this sense that the inertial field described by the Rindler metric may be called a *uniform gravitational field* – the force on an object is homogeneous in each CSO's frame, even though the proper acceleration (the local force per unit mass) is not. A detailed discussion of the issue of field uniformity in GR is given in Ref. 35. Thus, the force field defined by the discussed measuring procedure behaves as the Newtonian force in a homogeneous gravitational field. However, observers at different x_O positions will measure *different* forces for the same mass.

In Newtonian gravity, the potential satisfies a Laplace equation at points where the mass density vanishes. It is then natural to ask what kind of field equation is satisfied by the potential in (5). An immediate conspicuity is that there are two inequivalent ways to define the Laplacian, given the spacetime metric (3).

The first is to start from the spatial part γ_{ij} of the metric and take the general expression for the Laplacian in curvilinear coordinates

$$\Delta_s = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}\partial_i\sqrt{\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\partial_j \qquad (i,j = 1\ldots 3)\,, \tag{11}$$

where $\gamma = \det(\gamma_{ij})$. This is not unique, since the decomposition of spacetime into space and time is not, but if the metric is stationary, we can decompose spacetime into the proper time of CSOs and the proper space orthogonal to it, which both are unique. A clean way to define proper space as a congruence of world lines of test particles (or point-like observers) is presented in Ref. 36. Then $\gamma_{ij} = g_{ij} - g_{0i}g_{0j}/g_{00}$, where the subscript 0 refers to the time coordinate, as usual. In the case of the Rindler metric, $\gamma_{ij}\mathrm{d}x^i\mathrm{d}x^j = \mathrm{d}x^2 + \mathrm{d}y^2 + \mathrm{d}z^2$ $(i,j = 1\ldots 3)$, so the spatial Laplacian Δ_s is equal to the ordinary flat-space Laplacian in 3D. Obviously, the potential from Eq. (5) does *not* satisfy a Laplace equation with this Laplacian.

The second definition of a Laplacian uses the *full* spacetime metric to define a four-space Laplacian or d'Alembertian

$$\Box = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}}\partial_i\sqrt{|g|}g^{ij}\partial_j \qquad (i,j = 0\ldots 3)\,, \tag{12}$$

where $g = \det(g_{ij})$ and then takes as three-space Laplacian Δ_w the time independent part of the d'Alembertian. Whereas the d'Alembertian is unique, its decomposition into spatial and temporal parts is not, in principle. Again, the situation simplifies for stationary metrics, where the decomposition becomes invariant under coordinate transformations that leave the metric stationary.

For the Rindler metric, we find

$$\Box = -\frac{c^2}{\bar{g}^2x^2}\,\partial_t^2 + \frac{1}{x}\,\partial_x\,x\,\partial_x + \partial_y^2 + \partial_z^2\,, \tag{13}$$

hence $\Delta_w = \dfrac{1}{x}\,\partial_x\,x\,\partial_x + \partial_y^2 + \partial_z^2$, and it is easy to verify that

$$\Box\Phi(x) = \Delta_w\Phi(x) = 0\,, \tag{14}$$

i.e., with this *wave Laplacian*, the potential does satisfy a Laplace equation. Alternatively, we may simply consider it a *time independent* solution of the wave equation.

This then suggests to have a closer look at *time dependent* solutions to the wave equation, which turns out to be solved by plane waves of the form

$$\chi(x,t) = \psi\left(t \mp \frac{c}{\bar{g}}\ln x\right) = \tilde{\psi}\left(x\mathrm{e}^{\mp\bar{g}t/c}\right)\,, \tag{15}$$

where ψ or $\tilde{\psi}$ is an *arbitrary* function, required only to be twice continuously differentiable. The *temporal* wave form ψ is the same for arbitrary fixed position x; different values of x just correspond to different phases. The *spatial* wave form has the similarity property that for a fixed value of t, it is a squeezed or stretched version of the shape described by $\tilde{\psi}(x)$. The discussion of properties of solutions to the wave equation in a spherically symmetric spacetime will become important in the next section.

III. THE METRIC OUTSIDE A SPHERICAL MASS DISTRIBUTION

A. Special relativity and symmetry considerations

One of the simplest gravitating systems is a time-independent spherically symmetric mass distribution, describable by a stationary metric. The line element may

be written as

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -\tilde{f}(\tilde{r})\,c^2\mathrm{d}\tilde{t}^2 + 2\tilde{k}(\tilde{r})\,c\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{t}\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{r} + \tilde{h}(\tilde{r})\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{r}^2 + \tilde{n}(\tilde{r})\,\tilde{r}^2\left(\mathrm{d}\vartheta^2 + \sin^2\vartheta\,\mathrm{d}\varphi^2\right) . \tag{16}$$

In assuming the metric to have Minkowskian signature $(-,+,+,+)$,[37] we make sure this metric is compatible with SR. In Eq. (16), ϑ and φ are the usual angular coordinates which, due to spherical symmetry, may only appear in the combination $\mathrm{d}\Omega^2 = \mathrm{d}\vartheta^2 + \sin^2\vartheta\,\mathrm{d}\varphi^2$ but not in any of the coefficient functions. Because the metric is assumed time independent, none of the coefficients may depend on the time $\tilde{t}$. Therefore, all of them must be functions of the radial coordinate $\tilde{r}$ only. Only two of these four functions are fixed by physics, whereas two can be chosen with a great degree of arbitrariness, amounting to a choice of the time and radial coordinates.

For example, the prefactor $\tilde{n}(\tilde{r})$ of $\mathrm{d}\Omega^2$ may be chosen equal to one, meaning we define $\tilde{r} = r$ so that the surface area of a sphere about the coordinate center, described by $r = \text{const.}$ becomes $4\pi r^2$.[38] Instead, we might require $\tilde{h}(\tilde{r}) = \tilde{n}(\tilde{r})$, which would lead to isotropic coordinates. Moreover, a coordinate transformation of the form $\tilde{t} = t + w(\tilde{r})$ may be used to remove the term $\propto \mathrm{d}\tilde{t}\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{r}$.[39] The meaning of this coordinate transformation is a resynchronization of the clocks of CSOs.[40] If these (non-standard) clocks[41] have been set up to show time $\tilde{t}$, resetting them to time t is merely a local shift of the time origin.

For now, we will set $\tilde{n}(\tilde{r}) = 1$ (renaming the radial coordinate chosen this way to r) and choose a synchronization so that the metric becomes diagonal, introducing the time coordinate t. The metric then takes the form

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -f(r)\,c^2\mathrm{d}t^2 + h(r)\,\mathrm{d}r^2 + r^2\mathrm{d}\Omega^2 . \tag{17}$$

Alternative coordinate choices are considered in the appendix.

At large radii, gravitation becomes negligible, so the line element should approach that of the Minkowski metric, hence we require

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} f(r) = 1 , \qquad \lim_{r\to\infty} h(r) = 1 . \tag{18}$$

So far, just symmetry has been exploited. In order to determine $f(r)$ and $h(r)$, we need to invoke physical ideas.

B. Equivalence principle and potential

First, we make use of the EP. Instead of translating the physics in an accelerating system into terms of a gravitating one, which requires to visualize two different but equivalent systems in parallel, let us consider a freely falling observer in the *actual* system under consideration. The prescription then is to describe local physics in the frame of that inertial observer by SR. For the freely falling observer, there *is* no gravitational field and everything that the gravitational field does to CSOs must be due to the fact that they are accelerating with respect to his inertial frame.

As has been discussed in Ref. 17, by describing the observed frequency change of a photon sent from a CSO at position r to one at $r+\mathrm{d}r$ in a freely falling frame that is momentarily at rest with respect to the CSO at r, we can establish a relationship between the local acceleration potential $\Phi(r)$, related to the local proper acceleration $a(r)$ via

$$a(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{h(r)}}\frac{\mathrm{d}\Phi}{\mathrm{d}r} , \tag{19}$$

and the metric function $f(r)$. That relationship reads

$$\sqrt{\frac{f(r+\mathrm{d}r)}{f(r)}} = 1 + \frac{\Phi(r+\mathrm{d}r) - \Phi(r)}{c^2} \tag{20}$$

generating the differential equation

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{f'(r)}{f(r)} = \frac{1}{c^2}\Phi'(r) . \tag{21}$$

This is solved by

$$f(r) = \mathrm{e}^{2\Phi/c^2} , \tag{22}$$

where the standard boundary condition $\lim_{r\to\infty}\Phi(r) = 0$ of Newtonian physics has been used. Equation (22) can be found in textbooks[42] and merely reformulates the metric function $f(r)$ in terms of a more readily interpretable quantity that must approach the Newtonian potential as $r\to\infty$. Hence, $\Phi(r) \sim -GM/r$ $(r\to\infty)$ and we may infer the asymptotic behavior of $f(r)$ at large r:

$$f(r) \sim 1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2} , \qquad r\to\infty . \tag{23}$$

C. Global force field: absence of sources in vacuum

Let us now consider the gravitational force exerted on a mass m at the end of a massless rigid pole, felt by an observer at radius r_O holding the pole at its other end. We have considered a similar situation in the Rindler metric. Then, reasoning as in Sec. II, we obtain

$$F(r) = -\frac{\mathrm{d}E(r)}{\mathrm{d}\ell} = -\frac{\mathrm{d}E(r)}{\mathrm{d}r}\frac{\mathrm{d}r}{\mathrm{d}\ell} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{h(r)}}\frac{\mathrm{d}E(r)}{\mathrm{d}r} = -\frac{mc^2}{\sqrt{f(r_O)}}\frac{f'(r)}{2\sqrt{f(r)h(r)}} . \tag{24}$$

For simplicity, we let $r_O\to\infty$, implying $f(r_O) = 1$.

At this point, we introduce postulate P1. $F(r)$ is a global force field (measured by an observer at infinity), and we require its flux $\int F\mathrm{d}S$ through the surface S of a sphere about the center of gravity to remain constant outside of our mass distribution, in keeping with the idea that this mass distribution is the only source of gravity. If we visualize the force in terms of field lines, then every

field line must originate in a mass element for static fields, so all field lines that enter a spherical shell through its inner surface, must exit through its outer surface, if the shell does not contain any mass, i.e., in vacuum. Since r was chosen so that the surface area of such a sphere is $S = 4\pi r^2$, this means that $F(r) = A/r^2$ with some constant A that may be determined by comparison with the Newtonian limit, hence

$$F(r) = -G\frac{mM}{r^2}\,, \tag{25}$$

which gives us a first equation for the two functions $f(r)$ and $h(r)$:

$$\frac{f'(r)}{\sqrt{f(r)h(r)}} = \frac{2GM}{r^2c^2}\,. \tag{26}$$

D. Local formulation – vanishing divergence

The main disadvantage of our postulate in this formulation is that we need a *global* description of the force field. The global force $F(r)$ is not what a local observer would measure as gravitational force. Instead, the *local* force on the mass reads ($\boldsymbol{e}_r$ is a unit vector in the r direction):

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{F}_{\rm loc}(r) &= -ma(r)\,\boldsymbol{e}_r = -m\frac{1}{\sqrt{h(r)}}\frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial r}\,\boldsymbol{e}_r \\ &= -\frac{c^2}{2}\frac{f'(r)}{f(r)\sqrt{h(r)}}\,\boldsymbol{e}_r = \frac{F(r)}{\sqrt{f(r)}}\,\boldsymbol{e}_r\,.\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Noting that $\mathrm{d}\Phi = \nabla\Phi\cdot\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{s}$, where ∇ is the four-gradient, we obviously have $\partial\Phi/\partial r = \nabla\Phi\cdot\partial\boldsymbol{s}/\partial r = \nabla\Phi\cdot\sqrt{h}\,\boldsymbol{e}_r$, which shows that the local force is the spatial part of the four-gradient of Φ and its temporal part vanishes, i.e., with a slight abuse of notation[43] $\boldsymbol{F}_{\rm loc}(r) = -m\nabla\Phi$. Our requirement that the field is source free in vacuum should then take the form $\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{F}_{\rm loc} = 0$, with an appropriately defined divergence operator, valid in the curved spacetime. Experience with the Rindler metric suggests that this divergence is not the three-divergence of the restriction of spacetime to its spatial part but rather the four-divergence of a four-vector with zero time component:

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{F}_{\rm loc} = \nabla^j F_{{\rm loc}\,j} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}}\partial_i\sqrt{|g|}g^{ij}F_{{\rm loc}\,j} \\ &= -m\nabla^j(\nabla\Phi)_j = -m\,\Box\,\Phi\,.\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Hence postulate P1 has an explicit expression in terms of the potential, reading

$$\Box\,\Phi = \Delta_w\Phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}}\partial_i\sqrt{|g|}g^{ij}\partial_j\Phi = 0\,, \tag{29}$$

where Δ_w is the wave Laplacian again, obtained from the d'Alembertian by simply dropping the summand(s) containing time derivatives. For a purely r dependent potential, by use of $\sqrt{|g|} = c\sqrt{f(r)h(r)}r^2\sin\vartheta$, this reduces to

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{f(r)h(r)}r^2}\partial_r\sqrt{f(r)h(r)}r^2\frac{1}{h(r)}\partial_r\Phi = 0\,, \tag{30}$$

from which we obtain $\sqrt{f(r)/h(r)}r^2f'(r)/f(r) = \text{const.}$ using Eq. (21), hence

$$\frac{f'(r)}{\sqrt{f(r)h(r)}} = \frac{\tilde{A}}{r^2}\,. \tag{31}$$

The constant $\tilde{A}$ can be determined from the asymptotic behaviors (23) and $h(r) \sim 1$ ($r\to\infty$), yielding $\tilde{A} = r_s \equiv 2GM/c^2$, whence we recover (26). This demonstrates that postulate P1 may be reformulated as the requirement that the potential satisfy a Laplace equation obtained as the time independent limit of the wave equation constructible from the full metric. Since the potential itself is expressible by the metric functions, this is a constraint on the metric.

The postulate should be true for all stationary forms of the metric. While the potential Φ is not a four-scalar, it behaves as a scalar under coordinate transformations leaving the metric stationary. Note also that in this form, we expect the postulate not to be restricted to the spherically symmetric case. We will not, however, check its validity beyond that situation.

Our result also sheds some light on the fact that P1 is not powerful enough to determine the metric completely. P1 refers to a static aspect of the field only. The idea then immediately suggests itself that a second postulate ought to be a requirement on fully time dependent solutions of the wave equation, involving dynamic aspects, i.e., the relationship between space and time.

E. Wave equation and Huygens' principle

The vacuum wave equation in *flat space* has some remarkable properties, if the space has an *odd* number of dimensions (>1). Moreover, in a three-dimensional space, these properties take an even more fascinating form. The main property of interest here is the (strong) Huygens' principle.[44] It states that the wave solution at some event will only be influenced by other events precisely *on* its past light cone, not by events *inside* it,[45] i.e., the wave does not have a *tail*.[46]

Mathematically, this property follows from the fact that the retarded Green's function for the wave equation in $d = 2n+1$ dimensions ($n \geq 1$) is

$$\propto \frac{\mathrm{d}^{n-1}}{(R\,\mathrm{d}R)^{n-1}}\left[\frac{1}{R}\delta\left(t-t'-\frac{R}{c}\right)\right],$$

where $R = |\boldsymbol{r}-\boldsymbol{r}'|$.[47] Since the δ function and its derivatives are zero, whenever their argument is not, an observer at $\boldsymbol{r}$ is influenced by an event at $(t',\boldsymbol{r}')$ only, if

the time difference $t-t'$ it takes the wave to travel from $\boldsymbol{r}'$ to $\boldsymbol{r}$ is *exactly* $|\boldsymbol{r}-\boldsymbol{r}'|/c$ but not larger. In contrast, this is *not* true for an *even* number of spatial dimensions, $d=2n$, where the Green's function behaves as

$$\left[\frac{\mathrm{d}^{n-1}}{(R\,\mathrm{d}R)^{n-1}}\left((t-t')^2-R^2/c^2\right)^{-1/2}\right]\Theta\left(t-t'-\frac{R}{c}\right)$$

or in 1D, where

$$G(t,\boldsymbol{r},t',\boldsymbol{r}')=\frac{c}{2}\Theta\left(t-t'-\frac{R}{c}\right), \tag{32}$$

i.e., it is just a Heaviside function. Therefore, if a sufficiently short light pulse is created at the origin in three-dimensional space at time $t=0$, an observer at a distance R will see it at time $t=R/c$ and then no more, whereas a similar flash sent out from the origin of two-dimensional space will be seen at $t=R/c$ and *forever after*, albeit with continuously decreasing intensity. In 1D, the intensity will even remain constant.

Huygens' principle holds for all odd space dimensions greater than one.[48] If the dimension exceeds three, due to the appearance of derivatives of the δ function in the Green's function ($n>1$ in the formula above), the wave form will be distorted as the wave travels along. In three dimensions ($n=1$), however, the Green's function is just a δ function (multiplied by $1/R$), so a wave originating from a point source will travel at constant shape, just being damped by a factor of $1/R$ as the distance R from the source increases. Note that this does not imply that *all* wave solutions keep their temporal wave form. Obviously, a superposition of waves from two point sources cannot remain undistorted as its constituent waves will decay according to different spatial prefactors. Also, if the "point source" has internal structure, as is the case, e.g., with a Hertzian dipole, the total wave need not have a strictly preserved shape. We know that the electric field emitted from such a dipole has a near-field component decaying as the sum of a $1/R^2$ and a $1/R^3$ term, and a far-field component, carrying the energy to infinity that behaves as $1/R$. Any oscillating multipole has a leading field decaying as $1/R$ and this field will propagate at constant shape, whereas the superposition of near and far fields cannot of course be the same function of time at arbitrary distances (otherwise the near field would never die out). Clearly, *shape-preserving* solutions of the wave equation satisfy Huygens' principle, but the converse is not true.[49] These solutions (or rather a slight generalization, the so-called *similarity solutions*) are called *relatively undistorted* or *simple progressing* waves in Ref. 46.

The interesting thing about shape-preserving solutions of *arbitrary* waveform is that their presence or absence can be verified from the form of the wave equation in a pretty straightforward way, much more easily than whether Huygens' principle is satisfied or not. Moreover, shape preservation has a very direct interpretation that can be easily visualized. This is important when trying to establish the plausibility of a postulate. Mathematically, we may express the similarity property by saying that the wave equation has solutions of the form $\chi(r,t)=B(r)\psi(u)$ with arbitrary functions ψ, where u is some composite variable of t and r, e.g. $t-r/c$. Here, we restrict ourselves to a scalar wave, because it is the simplest way to assure that the wave may be thought of as coming from a structureless point source, i.e., it is guaranteed to have spherical symmetry. This keeps the mathematical discussion simple though we would of course be hard pressed to point out physical scalar waves traveling at the vacuum speed of light.[50]

One way (though not the only one) to demonstrate that a wave equation has this property is to show that it is possible to choose a function $B(r)$ so that the operator product of the d'Alembertian and $B(r)$ can be factorized according to

$$\begin{aligned}\Box\,B(r)=&\left(\bar{a}\partial_t+\bar{b}\partial_r+\bar{d}\right)\left(a\partial_t+b\partial_r\right)\\&+B(r)\times\text{angular derivatives}\,,\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where $\bar{a}$, $\bar{b}$, $\bar{d}$, a, and b are functions of r and t. The important point here is that the second factor in the operator product does not contain a term without a derivative. A similarity property is then implied, because we may obtain a solution by requiring $\psi(u)$ to satisfy

$$\left(a\partial_t+b\partial_r\right)\psi(u)=0 \tag{34}$$

with u independent of ϑ and φ. This is a first-order equation that can be solved by the method of characteristics, i.e., by finding a coordinate v satisfying

$$\frac{\partial t}{\partial v}=a\,,\quad \frac{\partial r}{\partial v}=b\quad\Rightarrow\quad \partial_v\psi(u)=0 \tag{35}$$

and hence $\psi(u)$ is constant as v varies. u is the second characteristic coordinate and determined in the solution process. Obviously, to verify whether the wave equation has this factorization property, it is sufficient to consider the operator $\Box^{(tr)}$ obtained from the d'Alembertian by dropping the terms containing angular derivatives (the action of which on $\psi(u)$ will always give zero, u being a function of t and r only).

In flat spacetime, we have

$$\Box^{(tr)}=\frac{1}{r^2}\partial_r r^2\partial_r-\frac{1}{c^2}\partial_t^2 \tag{36}$$

and setting $B(r)=\frac{1}{r}$, we may easily verify that

$$\Box^{(tr)}\frac{1}{r}=\frac{1}{r}\left(\partial_r-\frac{1}{c}\partial_t\right)\left(\partial_r+\frac{1}{c}\partial_t\right), \tag{37}$$

which proves the similarity property. Here, the characteristic equations $\partial t/\partial v=\frac{1}{c}$, $\partial r/\partial v=1$ with initial conditions $t(v=0)=u$ and $r(v=0)=0$ are solved by $r=v$ and $u=t-\frac{r}{c}$, so $\psi(u)=\psi\left(t-\frac{r}{c}\right)$. Because the last two factors in Eq. (37) commute, we may even infer the general spherically symmetric solution to the flat-spacetime scalar wave equation, which is given by $\chi(r,t)=\frac{1}{r}\left[\psi\left(t-\frac{r}{c}\right)+\tilde{\psi}\left(t+\frac{r}{c}\right)\right]$.

F. Dynamical postulate

The demonstration requires that the wave speed c is constant, i.e., the medium in which the wave propagates must either be *vacuum* or at least *homogeneous* (have a spatially constant index of refraction). In a curved spacetime, the wave speed normally varies as a function of position, so we do not expect the existence of general shape-preserving solutions to survive in a gravitational field. In fact, Ref. 46 gives as one reason for the appearance of wave tails, i.e., the invalidation of Huygens' principle "backscattering off potentials and/or spacetime curvature". A good way to search for a reasonable postulate replacing a field equation is to imagine ourselves being in the time before the development of general relativity, so we cannot take this kind of ideas about wave scattering by curvature for granted. Nevertheless, the suspicion that spacetime curvature will destroy Huygens' principle and hence, shape preservation of waves, is natural.

On the other hand, Eq. (15) tells us that in the Rindler metric one-dimensional shape-preserving waves[51] exist in spite of the fact that the wave speed varies locally.[52] Moreover, we know that in a local freely falling frame, if it is small enough, light waves will behave as in special relativity, i.e., as in flat spacetime, so the shape-preservation property should hold in vacuum for spherically symmetric waves. It must get lost in curved spacetime in general, but how should we visualize the transition from a local freely falling frame to a global one in a spherically symmetric situation?

Consider a spherically symmetric wave front moving outward from the center of gravity (or inward towards it). For any local inertial system, i.e., sufficiently small freely falling system, passed by the wave, it will, as reconstruction of the wave via Huygens' principle from wavelets on the front tells us, be either a locally planar wave (if the radius of curvature of the front is large enough in comparison with the local system) or a section of a spherical wave, propagating without distortion. Now consider the *spherically symmetric extension* of our local inertial system, i.e., the union of all local inertial systems obtained from it by rotations about the center of symmetry. Because a frame of reference is defined by (the non-intersecting worldlines of) a collection of observers,[36] the union of the freely falling observers on the spherical shell obtained by these symmetry operations constitutes a *new frame of reference*, but one that obviously is no longer inertial, because observers a large angular distance apart will not perceive themselves at rest with respect to each other.[53]

The many planar or curved pieces of the wave that these observers see should combine into a single spherical wave in their common non-inertial frame of reference. It then seems difficult to conceive of this spherical wave as *not* being shape-preserving at least for a short time interval during which neighboring observers consider each other inertial. After all, the wave travels in a shape-preserving manner in each local inertial system for the time interval considered and the extended system is obtained by symmetry operations applied to one of the local systems. How could a spherical solution, the pieces of which in each of the local systems remain solutions of the wave equation (by the EP) not be a solution in the combined system? This seems difficult to imagine.

Now it might be true for *any* metric that the union of the many wave sections into a spherically symmetric wave will give a shape-preserving wave. This would be satisfactory according to our visualization, but would of course prevent constraining the metric. On the other hand, if it is not true for *all* metrics, it seems reasonable to *postulate* it to be true for the *physical* metric.

To be precise, our second postulate – P2 – is that in a frame describing a freely falling spherical shell, which is local in the time and radial directions but global in the angular directions (so the frame is non-inertial), the wave equation has shape-preserving solutions of arbitrary wave form. Differently stated, we require a class of local-inertial-frame wave solutions that is valid during a short time interval, to be extensible to a solution global in ϑ and φ by spherical symmetry.

G. Application of the dynamical postulate

The recipe to apply this postulate then is to first transform the metric to a freely falling frame local in r and t. Due to the locality of the transformation, we need not care about integrability conditions. The equations of motion of the freely falling observers can be obtained from the Lagrangian

$$L = \frac{1}{2}\left(-f(r)\,c^2\dot{t}^2 + h(r)\,\dot{r}^2 + r^2\dot{\vartheta}^2 + r^2\sin^2\vartheta\dot{\varphi}^2\right) \quad (38)$$

associated with the metric (17), with overdots denoting derivatives with respect to the proper time τ. The Lagrangian does not depend on t explicitly, so

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{t}} = -f(r)\,c^2\dot{t} \quad (39)$$

is an integral of the motion (usually viewed as describing energy conservation). We set

$$f(r)\,c\dot{t} = c_l \quad (40)$$

with a constant c_l having the dimension of a velocity. This implies $f(r)\,c\mathrm{d}t = c_l\mathrm{d}\tau$ along the trajectory of a freely falling observer, and we require the constant c_l to be the same for all of them, due to symmetry. This defines a spherical freely falling shell in some sufficiently small r interval, say, between r and $r+\Delta r$. It is convenient to keep the spatial coordinates unchanged in specifying the shell. As has been mentioned before, a frame of reference is defined by the non-intersecting world lines of a collection of test particles or observers,[36] so the particular choice of spatial coordinates is unimportant.[54] P2 then means we assume any spatiotemporal distortions to the wave shape to be removable at fixed r by measuring the shape in the proper time variable of an appropriate set of freely falling observers. Since we may think

of distortions arising both from time dilation and spatial curvature effects, we might not expect this to be true in every metric, so there is a chance that P2 *will* impose a constraint.

The local coordinate transformation replacing t with τ produces the line element

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -\frac{c_l^2}{f(r)}\,\mathrm{d}\tau^2 + h(r)\,\mathrm{d}r^2 + r^2\left(\mathrm{d}\vartheta^2 + \sin^2\vartheta\mathrm{d}\varphi^2\right)\,. \quad (41)$$

The inverse and the determinant of the metric read

$$\left(g^{ij}_{(l)}\right) = \mathrm{diag}\left(-\frac{f(r)}{c_l^2}, \frac{1}{h(r)}, \frac{1}{r^2}, \frac{1}{r^2\sin^2\vartheta}\right)\,, \quad (42)$$

$$g_{(l)} = -c_l^2\frac{h(r)}{f(r)}r^4\sin^2\vartheta\,, \quad (43)$$

and the d'Alembertian becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\Box_{(l)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g_{(l)}|}}\partial_i\sqrt{|g_{(l)}|}\,g^{ij}_{(l)}\partial_j \\ &= -\frac{f(r)}{c_l^2}\partial_\tau^2 + \sqrt{\frac{f}{h}}\frac{1}{r^2}\partial_r\sqrt{\frac{h}{f}}r^2\frac{1}{h}\partial_r \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{r^2\sin\vartheta}\partial_\vartheta\sin\vartheta\partial_\vartheta + \frac{1}{r^2\sin^2\vartheta}\partial_\varphi^2\,. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

We may restrict attention to the time and radial derivatives

$$\Box^{(\tau r)}_{(l)} = -\frac{f(r)}{c_l^2}\partial_\tau^2 + \frac{1}{h}\partial_r^2 + \frac{1}{h}\left(\frac{2}{r} - \frac{(fh)'}{2fh}\right)\partial_r\,, \quad (45)$$

where a prime denotes a derivative with respect to r.

The next step is to require $\Box^{(\tau r)}_{(l)}$ to have the factorization property

$$\Box^{(\tau r)}_{(l)}B(r) = \frac{B(r)}{h(r)}\left(\partial_r + \bar{a}\partial_\tau + \bar{b}\right)\left(\partial_r - a\partial_\tau\right)\,. \quad (46)$$

It is obvious that the functions $\bar{a}$, $\bar{b}$, and a cannot depend on τ. Moving all the derivatives to the right on both sides of Eq. (46), we obtain the following set of equations for the coefficient functions of the five operators $\partial_r\partial_\tau$, ∂_τ^2, ∂_τ, ∂_r, and 1:

$$a(r) = \bar{a}(r)\,, \quad (47)$$

$$\bar{a}(r)\,a(r) = \frac{f(r)h(r)}{c_l^2}\,, \quad (48)$$

$$a'(r) + \bar{b}(r)a(r) = 0\,, \quad (49)$$

$$\bar{b}(r) = \frac{2}{r} - \frac{(fh)'}{2fh} + \frac{2B'(r)}{B(r)}\,, \quad (50)$$

$$0 = \frac{2B'(r)}{rB(r)} - \frac{(fh)'}{2fh}\frac{B'(r)}{B(r)} + \frac{B''(r)}{B(r)}\,. \quad (51)$$

The first two equations are solved by $a = \bar{a} = \pm\sqrt{fh}/c_l$, which on insertion in the third produces $\bar{b} = -(fh)'/2fh$. This leads to a major simplification of the fourth equation, giving $B'/B = -1/r$ and $B = c_1/r$ with some constant $c_1 \neq 0$. Then the first and third terms on the right-hand-side of the fifth equation cancel and we obtain

$$(f(r)h(r))' = 0 \quad (52)$$

as a condition that the metric must satisfy. This is a second equation for the two functions $f(r)$ and $h(r)$. Together with Eq. (26) and the boundary conditions (18), we have enough information to determine both f and h. First, Eq. (52) implies $f(r)h(r) = $ const. and the constant must be one, due to Eqs. (18). Therefore, $h(r) = 1/f(r)$. Plugging this into (26), we find

$$f'(r) = \frac{2GM}{r^2c^2}\,, \quad (53)$$

which is easily integrated. The constant of integration follows from the boundary conditions (18) once more and we end up with

$$f(r) = 1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2}\,, \qquad h(r) = \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2}\right)^{-1}\,. \quad (54)$$

This completes the determination of the metric, which turns out to produce the standard form

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2}\right)c^2\mathrm{d}t^2 + \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2}}\,\mathrm{d}r^2 + r^2\mathrm{d}\Omega^2 \quad (55)$$

of the Schwarzschild line element. Note that this is the correct line element outside of *any* spherically symmetric mass distribution, losing its validity only at r values inside the boundaries of the region of non-zero mass density. For a "point mass", it holds everywhere except at $r = 0$.

It may be useful to have a short look at the functional form of our spherical wave. The equation $(\partial_r - a\partial_\tau)\,\psi(u) = 0$ is solved by any function $\psi(t + r/c_l)$ $[\psi(t - r/c_l)]$, for $a = 1/c_l$ $[a = -1/c_l]$, hence $\mathrm{d}r/\mathrm{d}\tau = \pm c_l$ is the constant radial velocity of light in our freely falling frame. That it is not $\pm c$ is simply due to the fact that we did not rescale r in the coordinate transformation. $\mathrm{d}r$ is not a proper length increment. The amplitude of the wave decays as $1/r$, as the solution for $B(r)$ displays.

While our task of obtaining the Schwarzschild metric without using the field equations has been accomplished, doubts might remain that we may have inadvertently used some particular property of the standard Schwarzschild coordinates producing a fortuitous agreement. On the other hand, it can be argued that our postulates are of a physical nature and should therefore work in *any* appropriate coordinate system. To somewhat solidify this argument, I use the same approach in the appendix to derive the Schwarzschild metric in two further coordinate systems, one with a different radial, the other with a different time coordinate. Moreover, I employ the formalism there to explore the consequences of setting $\tilde{h}(\tilde{r}) = 1/\tilde{f}(\tilde{r})$ by assumption.

In the main text, we will stick to standard Schwarzschild coordinates and briefly discuss how P1 and P2 are related to the field equations.

IV. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FIELD EQUATIONS AND THE POSTULATES

For the general metric described by Eq. (17), the mixed components of the Ricci tensor take the form[55]

$$R^t_t = \frac{1}{fh}\left(\frac{f'h'}{4h} - \frac{f''}{2} + \frac{f'^2}{4f} - \frac{f'}{r}\right), \tag{56}$$

$$R^r_r = \frac{1}{fh}\left(\frac{f'h'}{4h} - \frac{f''}{2} + \frac{f'^2}{4f} + \frac{h'f}{hr}\right), \tag{57}$$

$$R^\vartheta_\vartheta = \frac{1}{rh}\left(\frac{h'}{2h} - \frac{f'}{2f} + \frac{h-1}{r}\right), \tag{58}$$

$$R^\varphi_\varphi = R^\vartheta_\vartheta, \tag{59}$$

with all other components being equal to zero. For a vacuum solution, the field equations reduce to the statement that the Ricci tensor equals zero. Hence, the nontrivial elements in Eqs. (56) through (59) must also be zero, and this should determine the functions $f(r)$ and $h(r)$. At first sight, three of these four equations might be independent, so solvability by two functions is not evident.

According to Eq. (30), combined with the representation of $\partial_r\Phi$ in terms of f [Eq. (21)], postulate P1 may be written as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial_r\sqrt{fh}r^2\frac{1}{h}\frac{f'}{f} = \partial_r\frac{f'r^2}{\sqrt{fh}} \\ &= -\frac{2r^2}{\sqrt{fh}}\left(-\frac{f''}{2} - \frac{f'}{r} + \frac{f'^2}{4f} + \frac{f'h'}{4h}\right) = -2r^2\sqrt{fh}\,R^t_t\,. \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Clearly, $R^t_t = 0$ implies postulate P1, which therefore follows from the field equations.

Moreover, the difference of Eqs. (56) and (57) is

$$R^t_t - R^r_r = -\frac{(fh)'}{fh^2r}, \tag{61}$$

so if both $R^t_t = 0$ and $R^r_r = 0$, then $(fh)' = 0$, which is Eq. (52), the condition that guarantees the factorization property (46) to hold. Hence, vanishing of the difference of these two elements of the Ricci tensor implies postulate P2, which means that P2 is also a consequence of the vacuum field equations.

Conversely, this also shows that if P1 and P2 hold, then we will certainly have $R^t_t = 0$ and $R^t_t - R^r_r = 0$, wherefrom $R^r_r = 0$, so two out of the three vacuum field equations are satisfied. But it is not immediately obvious that R^ϑ_ϑ must vanish, too. In fact, it seems that in order to show $R^\vartheta_\vartheta = 0$, we need, besides P1 and P2, the boundary conditions at infinity for one of the functions h and f at least, so the field equations do not follow from P1 and P2 alone. To see this, we first note that P2 implies

$$\frac{f'}{f} = -\frac{h'}{h}, \tag{62}$$

so R^r_r and R^ϑ_ϑ simplify

$$R^r_r = \frac{1}{fh}\left(-\frac{f''}{2} + \frac{h'f}{hr}\right), \tag{63}$$

$$R^\vartheta_\vartheta = \frac{1}{rh}\left(\frac{h'}{h} + \frac{h-1}{r}\right) = \frac{1}{r^2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{h}\right)r\right]. \tag{64}$$

Taking the derivative of Eq. (62), we may express R^r_r in terms of h alone

$$\frac{f''}{f} = -\frac{h''}{h} + 2\frac{h'^2}{h^2}, \tag{65}$$

$$R^r_r = \frac{h''}{2h^2} - \frac{h'^2}{h^3} + \frac{h'}{h^2r} = \frac{1}{2r^2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}\frac{h'r^2}{h^2}. \tag{66}$$

Since P1 and P2 imply that R^r_r vanishes, we have $h'/h^2 = A_1/r^2$ with some constant A_1. Integration yields $1/h = A_2 + A_1/r$. Using the boundary condition for h at infinity we have $A_2 = 1$ and $1 - 1/h = -A_1/r$, so that $(1 - 1/h)r$ is a constant and Eq. (64) shows that R^ϑ_ϑ is zero. Hence, P1 and P2 together with the boundary condition for h at infinity imply Einstein's vacuum field equations in the spherically symmetric case.

Note that once we have the field equations in the form (56) through (59), their solution is as simple, or simpler than, deriving $f(r)$ and $h(r)$ from our two postulates. However, the calculation of the Ricci tensor is an involved task, much lengthier than the mathematics of Sec. III. Nowadays, these calculations are facilitated by their implementation in computer algebra systems.

V. CONCLUSIONS

What has been shown in this article is that the role of the field equations in the derivation of the Schwarzschild metric can be replaced by appropriate postulates. Depending on the plausibility of these postulates, this is a viable approach to obtain some of the features of the full theory before embarking on the pursuit of the field equations. Obviously, any *new* postulate will be unfamiliar to everyone but its inventor at first. Therefore, it may be useful to put P1 and P2 into perspective with respect to the known ingredients SR, EP, and NL.

One major difference is, of course, that there is no need to *justify* using either SR, EP or NL, because special relativity is alive and well more than 110 years after its inception and has passed a huge number of experimental tests. Doubts against SR are usually not raised in serious scientific circles, even though certain themes such as its correct application to rotating systems are recurrent.[36,56,57] The Einstein equivalence principle is a cornerstone of the developments leading ultimately to general relativity, it is well-tested, too,[30] and almost as uncontested, although some concerns about its soundness were raised in the past[58] and modern quantum field theoretic ideas attack it on the basis of entirely new considerations.[59] These should however not be taken as serious arguments against its use in a *classical* field theory. Finally, Newton's laws have the largest experimental basis, validating them in their domain of applicability.

The postulates P1 and P2 have not been directly or consciously tested in experiments. But of course, since

they are a consequence of the field equations, their experimental support is as good as that of the latter, and the field equations have stood the test of 100 years of experiments by now,[30] including recent strong-field tests.[60]

It is however instructive to imagine a situation in which P1 and P2 had been suggested to Einstein in 1908. At that time, there were no field equations, special relativity had not yet been tested thoroughly and the EP in the version used here had been conceived just a year before.[61] Would Einstein have accepted the two postulates? Probably. But he would immediately have recognized their limitations. SR is the classical theory encompassing *all* phenomena (at scales well above atomic sizes) in freely falling local frames of reference, the EP is the meta-law spelling this out, and NL is valid whenever speeds and gravity become sufficiently small; therefore, SR, EP, and NL have an enormous scope, whereas P1 is restricted to stationary fields and P2 even to stationary spherically symmetric ones. Clearly, these two postulates have a much smaller range of applicability, and Einstein did strive for a general theory. The knowledge of an exact solution before the full theory might nevertheless have shortened his way to the field equations.

It should however be stressed that from a theoretical point of view, the ingredients SR, EP and NL are not unavoidable. While there is an obvious route to general relativity without P1 and P2 (the historical one), this does not single them out negatively. In fact, SR, EP, and NL are as replaceable in the axiomatic base of general relativity as P1 and P2. For SR and EP, this is nicely demonstrated in a pedagogical paper by Rindler,[62] in which he suggests that Riemann could have developed general relativity in 1854, at least to the level of the vacuum field equations. Neither special relativity nor an equivalence principle are needed for doing so. In fact, *none* of the postulates producing the theory in its full glory is immune to replacement by an alternative.

As to the question whether P1 and P2 are well-motivated – after all they may look a bit like a "tinker's approach", it may be pointed out that the way Einstein justified his various assumptions when constructing the theory in the years between 1907 and 1915 was not much different.[62] Before they can be tested experimentally, postulates are mostly based on beliefs about the properties a theory should have. P1 expresses the belief that the theory of gravitation should not have gravitational sources in vacuum, i.e., that vacuum cannot be polarized and no "apparent charges" acting as sources or sinks of the field will arise beyond the true sources constituted by matter or energy.[63] P2 expresses the belief that, given that the EP requires waves to exist that travel without a change of waveform in a local freely falling frame, this property may be continued to the spherical extension of such a frame by means of spherical symmetry about the center of gravity. That is, we assume that the spherically symmetric continuation of a local solution allows us to predict the short-time wave behavior in a particular non-inertial system. Whereas P1 is grounded in solid physics, P2 has a certain esthetic appeal. It seems to be true that nature prefers laws with beautiful features over nondescript ones, even though we do not know why. Then, it is often a good heuristic approach to search for nice regularities (such as the factorization property of the d'Alembertian) when trying to discover such a law.

History of course bypassed the postulates P1 and P2. They are not directly useful in developing the theory beyond the spherically symmetric case anyway, so the exercise might be considered futile today. Nevertheless, I believe it to be interesting for a few reasons.

First, there are still some indefatigable seekers of simpler ways to arrive at spacetime curvature and to explain everything from little more than special relativity.[64] For those, our discussion might clarify what it actually takes to obtain a result that otherwise is provided by the field equations. Whereas impossibility proofs may not convince everybody, a constructive approach demonstrating that in any case we need some assumptions *instead* of the field equations and what kind of assumptions are required, may help in increasing physical understanding. Since the field equations describe how mass-energy curves spacetime, assumptions that are to replace them cannot be disconnected from the question whether space is empty or not, and indeed both P1 and P2 refer to the vacuum outside a mass distribution.

Second, the exercise emphasizes tradition rather than revolution. I have tried to use as little geometry in the postulates as possible. For someone fully acquainted with Riemannian geometry, Einstein's postulates leading to the field equations cannot be beaten as regards their beauty and simplicity. But one has to embrace the geometrical point of view to begin with. For some students of the field, it may be easier to visualize force fields and wave phenomena in space than to think in terms of non-Euclidean geometry. Once they have realized that in simple cases such as the Schwarzschild metric, we can give a physical interpretation to the underlying geometrical theory, they may be less reluctant to take the geometrical stand point wherever it offers advantages in terms of insight.

Third, that postulates P1 and P2 are (as we have proven) satisfied in general relativity, teaches us something about the theory. From P1, we learn that in spite of the fact that gravity is explained in terms of the curvature of spacetime, an interpretation of the resulting attractive interaction as a force produces very familiar insights. The force behaves similar to other forces, whose source density can be identified and that are unscreened in vacuum, which means that an appropriately defined divergence of the force field vanishes. Helmholtz decomposition would then suggest that a full determination of the force field is possible, if its curl is known in addition. Rather (because the curl in four-space is a bit complicated), we have focused on obtaining the missing information from the wave equation. What we learn from P2 is that a wave behaves, in some important respects, just as in flat spacetime, and that this is true not only in a local freely falling system, where it is guaranteed by the EP, but also in a spherically symmetric extension of

such a system to a full spherical shell. What this means is that tidal forces, which would cause deviating behavior, are negligible, not only if the system is small enough in the radial and temporal directions to be considered inertial but also, and this is of course due to spherical symmetry, in a system that wraps around the center of symmetry and therefore cannot be inertial anymore. This is a result that becomes the more expected the longer one thinks about it, but which is nonetheless nontrivial.

Appendix A: Isotropic coordinates

Isotropic coordinates are characterized by the condition $\tilde{h}(\tilde{r}) = \tilde{n}(\tilde{r})$ in Eq. (16), which we impose after having removed the off-diagonal term containing $\tilde{k}(\tilde{r})$. We rename $\tilde{r}$ to ρ, $\tilde{f}$ to F and $\tilde{h}$ to H, whence Eq. (16) turns into

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -F(\rho)c^2\mathrm{d}t^2 + H(\rho)\left[\mathrm{d}\rho^2 + \rho^2\left(\mathrm{d}\vartheta^2 + \sin^2\vartheta\,\mathrm{d}\varphi^2\right)\right] \tag{A1}$$

and requiring the metric to become Minkowskian at infinity, we have $\lim_{\rho\to\infty} F(\rho) = 1$, $\lim_{\rho\to\infty} H(\rho) = 1$.

Moreover, we are entitled to assume that ρ approaches the standard flat space radial coordinate r as $\rho \to \infty$.[65] The inverse and the determinant of the metric are

$$\left(g^{ij}\right) = \mathrm{diag}\left(-\frac{1}{F(\rho)\,c^2}, \frac{1}{H(\rho)}, \frac{1}{H(\rho)\,\rho^2}, \frac{1}{H(\rho)\,\rho^2\sin^2\vartheta}\right), \tag{A2}$$

$$g = -c^2F(\rho)H(\rho)^3\rho^4\sin^2\vartheta\,. \tag{A3}$$

Again, we set $F(\rho) = \mathrm{e}^{2\Phi(\rho)/c^2}$ and may interpret, by virtue of the EP, $\Phi(\rho)$ as a potential allowing us to calculate the proper acceleration of CSOs, once $H(\rho)$ is known. The Newtonian limit then provides us with the asymptotic behavior $F(\rho) \sim 1 - 2GM/\rho c^2$ ($\rho \to \infty$), because $\rho \sim r$ ($\rho \to \infty$).

The radial part of the d'Alembertian is given by

$$\Box^{(\rho)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{F(\rho)H(\rho)^3}\rho^2}\partial_\rho\sqrt{F(\rho)H(\rho)^3}\rho^2\frac{1}{H(\rho)}\partial_\rho \tag{A4}$$

and postulate P1 requires $\Box\,\Phi(\rho) = \Box^{(\rho)}\Phi(\rho) = 0$, leading to

$$\sqrt{F(\rho)H(\rho)}\rho^2\frac{F'(\rho)}{F(\rho)} = \text{const.} \tag{A5}$$

Using the limiting behaviors of $F(\rho)$ and $H(\rho)$ for large ρ, we evaluate the constant to be $2GM/c^2$ and arrive at

$$\frac{F'(\rho)}{\sqrt{F(\rho)}} = \frac{2GM}{c^2\rho^2\sqrt{H(\rho)}}\,. \tag{A6}$$

To apply postulate P2, we first have to transform to the proper time of a freely falling frame, using energy conservation

$$F(\rho)\,c\dot{t} = c_l = \text{const.} \tag{A7}$$

The transformed metric, its inverse and determinant read

$$\left(g_{(l)\,ij}\right) = \mathrm{diag}\left(-\frac{c_l^2}{F(\rho)}, H(\rho), H(\rho)\rho^2, H(\rho)\rho^2\sin^2\vartheta\right), \tag{A8}$$

$$\left(g^{ij}_{(l)}\right) = \mathrm{diag}\left(-\frac{F(\rho)}{c_l^2}, \frac{1}{H(\rho)}, \frac{1}{H(\rho)\rho^2}, \frac{1}{H(\rho)\rho^2\sin^2\vartheta}\right), \tag{A9}$$

$$g_{(l)} = -c_l^2\frac{H(\rho)^3}{F(\rho)}\rho^4\sin^2\vartheta\,, \tag{A10}$$

and the temporal plus radial parts of the d'Alembertian in the freely falling system are obtained as

$$\begin{aligned}\Box^{(\tau\rho)}_{(l)} &= -\frac{F(\rho)}{c_l^2}\partial_\tau^2 + \sqrt{\frac{F}{H^3}}\frac{1}{\rho^2}\partial_\rho\sqrt{\frac{H^3}{F}}\rho^2\frac{1}{H}\partial_\rho \\ &= -\frac{F(\rho)}{c_l^2}\partial_\tau^2 + \frac{1}{H}\partial_\rho^2 + \frac{1}{H}\left(\frac{2}{\rho} - \frac{F'}{2F} + \frac{H'}{2H}\right)\partial_\rho\,.\end{aligned} \tag{A11}$$

We require the factorization

$$\Box^{(\tau\rho)}_{(l)}B(\rho) = \frac{B(\rho)}{H(\rho)}\left(\partial_\rho + \bar{a}\partial_\tau + \bar{b}\right)\left(\partial_\rho - a\partial_\tau\right) \tag{A12}$$

to hold, which gives

$$\bar{a} = a\,, \tag{A13}$$

$$\bar{a}a = \frac{FH}{c_l^2} \quad\Rightarrow\quad a = \pm\frac{\sqrt{FH}}{c_l}\,, \tag{A14}$$

$$a' + a\bar{b} = 0 \quad\Rightarrow\quad \bar{b} = -\frac{(FH)'}{2FH}\,, \tag{A15}$$

$$\bar{b} = \frac{2}{\rho} - \frac{F'}{2F} + \frac{H'}{2H} + \frac{2B'}{B}\,, \tag{A16}$$

$$0 = \left(\frac{2}{\rho} - \frac{F'}{2F} + \frac{H'}{2H}\right)\frac{B'}{B} + \frac{B''}{B}\,. \tag{A17}$$

Combining Eqs. (A15) and (A16) and simplifying Eq. (A17) we have

$$0 = \frac{2}{\rho} + \frac{H'}{H} + \frac{2B'}{B}\,, \tag{A18}$$

$$0 = \frac{2}{\rho} - \frac{F'}{2F} + \frac{H'}{2H} + \frac{B''}{B'}\,. \tag{A19}$$

Each of these equations can be integrated once to yield

$$B = c_1\frac{1}{\rho\sqrt{H}}\,, \tag{A20}$$

$$B' = c_2\frac{1}{\rho^2}\sqrt{\frac{F}{H}}\,, \tag{A21}$$

and the large ρ asymptotics leads to $B \sim c_1/\rho$ and $B' \sim c_2/\rho^2$ from which we may immediately conclude that $c_2 = -c_1$, hence $B'/B = -\sqrt{F}/\rho$, which allows us to eliminate B'/B from Eq. (A18) and to write down a second equation for the two functions F and H:

$$\sqrt{F(\rho)} = 1 + \frac{\rho H'(\rho)}{2H(\rho)}\,. \tag{A22}$$

The system of equations (A6) and (A22) is much more difficult to solve than the corresponding equations in standard Schwarzschild coordinates. Nevertheless, an analytic solution can be found by a series of clever transformations. First, we note that taking the derivative of (A22), we generate half the left-hand side of (A6) and therefore can eliminate F:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\rho}\frac{\rho H'}{2H} = \frac{GM}{c^2\rho^2\sqrt{H}} = \frac{r_s}{2\rho^2\sqrt{H}}\,, \tag{A23}$$

which is a nonlinear second-order differential equation for H. Next, we introduce a new variable x and a function $Y(x)$ by the requirements

$$x = \rho\sqrt{H}\,, \qquad \sqrt{H}\mathrm{d}\rho = \sqrt{Y}\mathrm{d}x\,. \tag{A24}$$

The asymptotic behavior of H for $\rho \to \infty$ then implies $x \sim \rho$ ($\rho \to \infty$) and $Y(x) \sim 1$ ($x \to \infty$). Taking the derivative of x w.r.t. ρ, we get

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}\rho} = \sqrt{H}\left(1 + \frac{\rho H'}{2H}\right) \quad \Rightarrow \quad 1 + \frac{\rho H'}{2H} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{Y}} \tag{A25}$$

and Eq. (A23) turns into

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{Y}}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}\frac{1}{\sqrt{Y}} = -\frac{Y'(x)}{2Y^2} = \frac{r_s}{2x^2}\,, \tag{A26}$$

which may be integrated, using $\lim_{x\to\infty} Y(x) = 1$, to give

$$Y(x) = \frac{1}{1 - r_s/x}\,. \tag{A27}$$

From Eq. (A24), we get

$$\frac{x}{\rho}\mathrm{d}\rho = \sqrt{Y}\mathrm{d}x \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho}{\rho} = \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\sqrt{x^2 - r_s x}}\,, \tag{A28}$$

which can be integrated immediately

$$\ln\rho + \tilde{A} = \operatorname{arcosh}\left(\frac{2x}{r_s} - 1\right). \tag{A29}$$

$\tilde{A} \equiv \ln A$ is a constant of integration. Inversion is achieved by simply applying the cosh function to both sides

$$\frac{2x}{r_s} - 1 = \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{e}^{\ln(\rho A)} + \mathrm{e}^{-\ln(\rho A)}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\rho A + \frac{1}{\rho A}\right). \tag{A30}$$

Taking the limit $\rho \to \infty$, we see that $A = 4/r_s \equiv 1/\rho_s$. Replacing x with $\rho\sqrt{H}$ again, we find

$$\rho\sqrt{H} = \frac{r_s}{2} + \rho + \frac{r_s^2}{16\rho} = \rho\left(1 + 2\frac{\rho_s}{\rho} + \frac{\rho_s^2}{\rho^2}\right), \tag{A31}$$

hence

$$H(\rho) = \left(1 + \frac{\rho_s}{\rho}\right)^4. \tag{A32}$$

Noting that $F = 1/Y = 1 - r_s/\rho\sqrt{H}$ [from Eqs. (A25) and (A22)], we finally obtain

$$F(\rho) = \frac{\left(1 - \rho_s/\rho\right)^2}{\left(1 + \rho_s/\rho\right)^2}\,. \tag{A33}$$

The resulting line element

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -\left(\frac{1 - \rho_s/\rho}{1 + \rho_s/\rho}\right)^2 c^2\mathrm{d}t^2 + \left(1 + \frac{\rho_s}{\rho}\right)^4\left(\mathrm{d}\rho^2 + \rho^2\mathrm{d}\Omega^2\right) \tag{A34}$$

agrees with the form of the isotropic Schwarzschild line element found in the literature.[66] Note that for real ρ, this metric does not cover the part of spacetime inside the event horizon.

Appendix B: Gullstrand-Painlevé coordinates

Here we consider yet another choice of the independent functions in the metric (16), requiring $\tilde{h}(\tilde{r}) = \tilde{n}(\tilde{r}) = 1$. Since this reduces the number of independent functions to two, we have no freedom left to set $\tilde{k}(\tilde{r})$ equal to zero. This means that our time coordinate is different from the one(s) in the previous examples, because we have not performed the transformation to a time-orthogonal frame. We rename $\tilde{r} = r$, $\tilde{t} = T$, $\tilde{f} = f$, and $\tilde{k} = k$. Because $\tilde{n}(r) = 1$, r is indeed the same radial coordinate as in Sec. III. The metric, its inverse and its determinant are given by

$$(g_{ij}) = \begin{pmatrix} -f(r)c^2 & k(r)c & 0 & 0 \\ k(r)c & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & r^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & r^2\sin^2\vartheta \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B1}$$

$$\left(g^{ij}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{(f+k^2)c^2} & \frac{k}{(f+k^2)c} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{k}{(f+k^2)c} & \frac{f}{(f+k^2)} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{r^2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{r^2\sin^2\vartheta} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B2}$$

$$g = -\left(f + k^2\right)c^2 r^4 \sin^2\vartheta\,. \tag{B3}$$

The boundary conditions to the functions f and k are $\lim_{r\to\infty} f(r) = 1$, $\lim_{r\to\infty} k(r) = 0$. Now, the d'Alembertian contains mixed terms involving $\partial_T\partial_r$, but these do not play any role in the application of postulate P1, where the presence of any other derivative than ∂_r in a term makes it disappear. We only need $\Box^{(r)}$. Setting $f(r) = \mathrm{e}^{2\Phi(r)/c^2}$ and requiring

$$\begin{aligned}\Box\,\Phi(r) &= \Box^{(r)}\Phi(r) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{f + k^2}\,r^2}\partial_r\frac{r^2 f}{\sqrt{f + k^2}}\partial_r\Phi(r) = 0\,,\end{aligned} \tag{B4}$$

we find

$$\partial_r\Phi(r) = \frac{c^2}{2}\frac{f'}{f} = \frac{A\sqrt{f + k^2}}{r^2 f}\,. \tag{B5}$$

Taking advantage of the limiting behavior of f and k at large r as well as the Newtonian limit, we determine the constant $A = GM = c^2 r_s/2$. Thus we obtain

$$f' = \sqrt{f+k^2}\,\frac{r_s}{r^2}\,, \tag{B6}$$

a first relationship between the functions f and k.

To transform the metric using the proper time of freely falling observers, we note that stationarity again implies a conservation law, but now the Lagrangian involves the product $\dot{T}\dot{r}$, so the law takes a slightly different form

$$\begin{aligned} fc\dot{T} - k\dot{r} &= c_l = \text{const.} \\ \mathrm{d}T &= \frac{c_l}{fc}\mathrm{d}\tau + \frac{k}{fc}\mathrm{d}r\,. \end{aligned} \tag{B7}$$

We then find for the line element in the local metric

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -\frac{c_l^2}{f(r)}\mathrm{d}\tau^2 + \left(1+\frac{k(r)^2}{f(r)}\right)\mathrm{d}r^2 + r^2\left(\mathrm{d}\vartheta^2+\sin^2\vartheta\,\mathrm{d}\varphi^2\right)\,, \tag{B8}$$

i.e., transforming to a frame of freely falling observers diagonalizes the metric, not unexpectedly. The inverse and determinant of the local metric read

$$\left(g^{ij}_{(l)}\right) = \mathrm{diag}\left(-\frac{f(r)}{c_l^2}, \frac{f(r)}{f(r)+k(r)^2}, \frac{1}{r^2}, \frac{1}{r^2\sin^2\vartheta}\right)\,, \tag{B9}$$

$$g_{(l)} = -c_l^2\,\frac{f(r)+k(r)^2}{f(r)^2}\,r^4\sin^2\vartheta\,, \tag{B10}$$

and the temporal plus radial parts of the local d'Alembertian become

$$\begin{aligned} \Box^{(\tau r)}_{(l)} &= -\frac{f}{c_l^2}\partial_\tau^2 + \frac{f}{r^2\sqrt{f+k^2}}\partial_r\frac{r^2}{\sqrt{f+k^2}}\partial_r \\ &= -\frac{f}{c_l^2}\partial_\tau^2 + \frac{f}{f+k^2}\partial_r^2 + \frac{f}{f+k^2}\left(\frac{2}{r} - \frac{f'+2kk'}{2(f+k^2)}\right)\partial_r\,. \end{aligned} \tag{B11}$$

The factorization ansatz

$$\Box^{(\tau r)}_{(l)} B(r) = Bf\left(\bar{a}\partial_\tau + \bar{b}\partial_r + \bar{d}\right)\left(-a\partial_\tau + b\partial_r\right) \tag{B12}$$

produces the following equations for the coefficient functions (with the abbreviation $\xi = f + k^2$)

$$\bar{a}a = \frac{1}{c_l^2} \quad\Rightarrow\quad \bar{a} = \frac{1}{c_l^2 a}\,, \tag{B13}$$

$$\bar{a}b - \bar{b}a = 0\,, \tag{B14}$$

$$a'\bar{b} + \bar{d}a = 0\,, \tag{B15}$$

$$\bar{b}b = \frac{1}{\xi} \quad\Rightarrow\quad \bar{b} = \frac{1}{\xi b}\,, \tag{B16}$$

$$\bar{b}b' + \bar{d}b = \frac{1}{\xi}\left(\frac{2}{r} - \frac{\xi'}{2\xi} + \frac{2B'}{B}\right)\,, \tag{B17}$$

$$0 = \frac{2}{r} - \frac{\xi'}{2\xi} + \frac{B''}{B'}\,. \tag{B18}$$

Using Eqs. (B13) and (B16) in Eq. (B14), we obtain

$$\frac{b}{a} = \pm\frac{c_l}{\sqrt{\xi}}\,. \tag{B19}$$

Equation (B15) may then be used to eliminate $\bar{d}$ from Eq. (B17)

$$\frac{1}{\xi}\left(\frac{2}{r} - \frac{\xi'}{2\xi} + \frac{2B'}{B}\right) = \bar{b}b' - \frac{a'}{a}\bar{b}b = \frac{1}{\xi}\left(\frac{b'}{b} - \frac{a'}{a}\right)\,, \tag{B20}$$

and we can drop the factor $1/\xi$ from this equation. Multiplying Eq. (B19) through with a and taking the derivative with respect to r, we find the nice relationship

$$\frac{b'}{b} = \frac{a'}{a} - \frac{\xi'}{2\xi}\,, \tag{B21}$$

which after insertion on the right-hand side of (B20) produces

$$\frac{2}{r} + \frac{2B'}{B} = 0\,. \tag{B22}$$

This can be integrated and yields $B = c_1/r$. Then $B' = -c_1/r^2$ and $B'' = 2c_1/r^3$, which gives us $B''/B' = -2/r$. Inserting this into (B18), we end up with $\xi' = 0 \Rightarrow \xi = f + k^2 = \text{const.}$, and the constant is determined taking the limit $r \to \infty$, so we have as second equation for f and k

$$f(r) + k(r)^2 = 1\,. \tag{B23}$$

Plugging this into Eq. (B6), we get the simple equation

$$f'(r) = \frac{r_s}{r^2}\,, \tag{B24}$$

which can be immediately integrated using the boundary condition at infinity once again, and we finally obtain:

$$f(r) = 1 - \frac{r_s}{r}\,, \qquad k(r) = \pm\sqrt{\frac{r_s}{r}}\,. \tag{B25}$$

The more useful ingoing Gullstrand-Painlevé coordinates are obtained for positive $k(r)$. The resulting line element

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -\left(1-\frac{r_s}{r}\right)c^2\mathrm{d}T^2 + 2\sqrt{\frac{r_s}{r}}\,c\mathrm{d}T\,\mathrm{d}r + \mathrm{d}r^2 + r^2\mathrm{d}\Omega^2 \tag{B26}$$

agrees with the standard form of the Painlevé-Gullstrand line element found in the literature.[66] Note that had we chosen $\tilde{h}(r) = 0$ and $\tilde{n}(r) = 1$ at the beginning of this section, we would have obtained, by an almost identical calculation, Eddington-Finkelstein coordinates.[66]

Appendix C: Metric with imposed reciprocity of temporal and spatial components

Finally, let us *require* $g_{rr} = -1/g_{tt}$ in the metric (16) (we immediately omit the tildes). This leaves us the freedom to still choose another one of the metric functions

which we do by taking the metric to be time-orthogonal (i.e., we set $k(r) = 0$). Then

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = -f(r)\,c^2\mathrm{d}t^2 + \frac{1}{f(r)}\,\mathrm{d}r^2 + n(r)\,r^2\left(\mathrm{d}\vartheta^2 + \sin^2\vartheta\,\mathrm{d}\varphi^2\right), \tag{C1}$$

with $\lim_{r\to\infty} f(r) = 1$ and $\lim_{r\to\infty} n(r) = 1$. The inverse and determinant of the metric are

$$\left(g^{ij}\right) = \mathrm{diag}\left(-\frac{1}{f(r)\,c^2}, f(r), \frac{1}{n(r)\,r^2}, \frac{1}{n(r)\,r^2\sin^2\vartheta}\right), \tag{C2}$$

$$g = -c^2 n(r)^2 r^4 \sin^2\vartheta\,, \tag{C3}$$

which gives postulate P1 the form

$$\Box^{(r)}\Phi(r) = \frac{1}{n(r)\,r^2}\partial_r n(r) r^2 f(r)\partial_r\Phi(r) = 0\,, \tag{C4}$$

from which we obtain

$$\frac{f'(r)}{f(r)} = \frac{A}{n(r)f(r)r^2} \tag{C5}$$

which after determination of the constant A reads

$$f'(r) = \frac{2GM}{c^2 n(r) r^2}\,. \tag{C6}$$

The proper time of a freely falling frame again is given by $f(r)\,c\mathrm{d}t = c_l\,\mathrm{d}\tau$. Via insertion of this into the line element, we obtain the local metric, its inverse and its determinant

$$\left(g_{(l)\,ij}\right) = \mathrm{diag}\left(-\frac{c_l^2}{f(r)}, \frac{1}{f(r)}, n(r)r^2, n(r)r^2\sin^2\vartheta\right), \tag{C7}$$

$$\left(g^{ij}_{(l)}\right) = \mathrm{diag}\left(-\frac{f(r)}{c_l^2}, f(r), \frac{1}{n(r)r^2}, \frac{1}{n(r)r^2\sin^2\vartheta}\right), \tag{C8}$$

$$g_{(l)} = -c_l^2\frac{n(r)^2}{f(r)^2}r^4\sin^2\vartheta\,. \tag{C9}$$

The temporal plus radial parts of the local d'Alembertian are

$$\begin{aligned}\Box^{(\tau r)}_{(l)} &= -\frac{f}{c_l^2}\partial_\tau^2 + \frac{f}{nr^2}\partial_r\frac{nr^2}{f}f\,\partial_r \\ &= -\frac{f}{c_l^2}\partial_\tau^2 + f\partial_r^2 + f\left(\frac{n'}{n} + \frac{2}{r}\right)\partial_r\,.\end{aligned} \tag{C10}$$

To implement P2 and factorize, we take the ansatz

$$\Box^{(\tau r)}_{(l)}B(r) = Bf\left(\partial_r + \bar{a}\partial_\tau + \bar{b}\right)\left(\partial_r - a\partial_\tau\right), \tag{C11}$$

which leads to the following equations for the coefficient functions

$$\bar{a} = a\,, \tag{C12}$$

$$\bar{a}\,a = \frac{1}{c_l^2}\,, \tag{C13}$$

$$a' + \bar{b}a = 0\,, \tag{C14}$$

$$\bar{b} = \frac{2}{r} + \frac{n'}{n} + \frac{2B'}{B}\,, \tag{C15}$$

$$0 = \frac{B''}{B} + \frac{B'}{B}\left(\frac{2}{r} + \frac{n'}{n}\right). \tag{C16}$$

In the light of the preceding calculations, the solution is pretty straightforward: $a = \bar{a} = \pm 1/c_l$, $\bar{b} = 0$, $B = c_1/\sqrt{n}r$, and $B' = c_2/nr^2$. Since $\lim_{r\to\infty} n(r) = 1$, we can again conclude that $c_2 = -c_1$. This implies $B'/B = -1/\sqrt{n}r$, wich on insertion in (C15) gives an equation for $n(r)$ that can be solved by separation of variables

$$\frac{1}{r} + \frac{n'}{2n} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}r} = 0 \quad\Rightarrow\quad \frac{n'}{2(\sqrt{n}-n)} = \frac{1}{r}\,. \tag{C17}$$

This is simplified a little by substituting $n = p^2$, leading to $p'/(1-p) = 1/r$, which can be integrated to yield $1-p = r_0/r$, where r_0 is a constant of integration. We therefore end up with

$$n(r) = \left(1 - \frac{r_0}{r}\right)^2\,. \tag{C18}$$

Inserting this into Eq. (C6) we may determine the function $f(r)$ from

$$f'(r) = \frac{r_s}{(1-r_0/r)^2\,r^2} = \frac{r_s}{(r-r_0)^2}\,, \tag{C19}$$

obtaining

$$f(r) = 1 - \frac{r_s}{r - r_0}\,. \tag{C20}$$

The line element then becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d}s^2 = &-\left(1 - \frac{2GM}{(r-r_0)c^2}\right)c^2\mathrm{d}t^2 + \frac{1}{1 - 2GM/(r-r_0)c^2}\,\mathrm{d}r^2 \\ &+ (r-r_0)^2\left(\mathrm{d}\vartheta^2 + \sin^2\vartheta\,\mathrm{d}\varphi^2\right).\end{aligned} \tag{C21}$$

This is a generalization of the Schwarzschild metric, obtainable from the latter by a coordinate transformation $r \to r + r_0$. For $r_0 \neq 0$, r is no longer the circumferential radial coordinate. What this result shows is that requiring $g_{rr} = -1/g_{tt}$ in the general ansatz is not sufficient to obtain the standard form of the Schwarzschild metric. Instead, this condition is satisfied by a whole one-parameter family of coordinates.

---

[1] I. Newton, *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica* (Royal Society, E. Halley, 1686) For an English translation see, e.g., I. B. Cohen and A. Whitman (1999).

[2] C. F. Gauss, "Theoria attractionis corporum sphaeroidicorum ellipticorum homogeneorum methodo nova tractata," Commentationes societatis regiae scientiarium Gottingensis recentiores **2**, 355–378 (1813).

[3] C. A. de Coulomb, "Premier mémoire sur l'électricité et le magnétisme," Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Sciences, 569–577 (1785).

[4] C. A. de Coulomb, "Second mémoire sur l'électricité et le magnétisme," Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Sciences, 578–611 (1785).

[5] S.-D. Poisson, "Remarques sur une équation qui se présente dans la théorie des attractions des sphéroïdes," Bulletin de la Société Philomathique de Paris **3**, 388–392 (1813).

[6] A. Einstein, "Die Feldgleichungen der Gravitation," in *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich-Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Reimer, Berlin, 1915) pp. 844–847.

[7] K. Schwarzschild, "Über das Gravitationsfeld eines Massenpunktes nach der Einsteinschen Theorie," in *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich-Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Reimer, Berlin, 1916) pp. 189–196, English translation: *On the Gravitational Field of a Mass Point According to Einstein's Theory* S. Antoci and A. Loinger, arXiv:physics/9905030v1.

[8] J. Droste, "The field of a single centre in Einstein´s theory of gravitation, and the motion of a particle in that field," Ned. Acad. Wet., SA **19**, 197–215 (1917).

[9] T. Jacobson, "When is $g_{tt}g_{rr} = -1$?" Class. Quant. Grav. **24**, 5717–5719 (2007).

[10] P. Rowlands, "A simple approach to the experimental consequences of general relativity," Physics Education **32**, 49–55 (1997).

[11] R. R. Cuzinatto, B. M. Pimental, and P. J. Pompeia, "Schwarzschild and de Sitter solutions from the argument by Lenz and Sommerfeld," Am. J. Phys. **79**, 662–667 (2011).

[12] J. Czerniawski, "The possibility of a simple derivation of the Schwarzschild metric," `http://www.relativitycalculator.com/pdfs/schwarzschild/simple_derivation.pdf` (2006).

[13] A. Sommerfeld, *Electrodynamics. Lectures on Theoretical Physics*, Vol. III (Academic Press, New York, 1952).

[14] L. I. Schiff, "On Experimental Tests of the General Theory of Relativity," Am. J. Phys. **28**, 340–343 (1960).

[15] A. Schild, "Equivalence Principle and Red-Shift Measurements," Am. J. Phys. **28**, 778–780 (1960).

[16] G is Newton's gravitational constant, c the speed of light, M the gravitating mass and r the radial coordinate at which the metric is considered.

[17] K. Kassner, "Classroom reconstruction of the Schwarzschild metric," Eur. J. Phys. **36**, 065031 (1–20), (2015).

[18] C. Brans and R. H . Dicke, "Mach's Principle and a Relativistic Theory of Gravitation," Phys. Rev. **124**, 925–935 (1961).

[19] W. M. Sacks and J. A. Ball, "Simple derivations of the Schwarzschild metric," Am. J. Phys. **36**, 240–245 (1968).

[20] W. Rindler, "Counterexample to the Lenz-Schiff Argument," Am. J. Phys. **36**, 540–544 (1968).

[21] It was already "well-known" to Einstein,[67] when Rindler still was a school boy.

[22] R. P. Gruber, R. H. Price, S. M. Matthews, W. R. Cordwell, and L. F. Wagner, "The impossibility of a simple derivation of the Schwarzschild metric," Am. J. Phys. **56**, 265–269 (1988).

[23] Hence, the postulates should be derivable from the field equations but need not imply their general form.

[24] F. R. Tangherlini, "Postulational Approach to Schwarzschild's Exterior Solution with Application to a Class of Interior Solutions," Nuovo Cimento **25**, 1081–1105 (1962).

[25] W. Rindler, "Counterexample to the Tangherlini Argument," Am. J. Phys. **37**, 72–73 (1969).

[26] N. Dadhich, "Einstein is Newton with space curved," (2012), arXiv:1206.0635v1.

[27] S. Deser, "Stressless Schwarzschild," Gen. Rel. Grav. **46**, 1615 (2014).

[28] J. B. Hartle, "General relativity in the undergraduate physics curriculum," Am. J. Phys. **74**, 14–21 (2006).

[29] This is a version of the equivalence principle going well beyond mere universality of free fall, which is also valid in Newtonian physics and sometimes called the weak equivalence principle. On the other hand, the Einstein equivalence principle is weaker than the strong equivalence principle, which may be formulated by dropping the qualifier *non-gravitational* from the Einstein version and stating that *all* experiments including gravitational ones run the same way in a local freely falling system, no matter what the velocity and spatiotemporal position of the system. As soon as gravity is involved, special relativity can no longer be used to formulate the corresponding laws, as SR does not describe gravitational experiments, such as, e.g., a local measurement of the gravitational constant using a Cavendish balance.[30] Nevertheless, local Lorentz invariance and the standard local spacetime symmetries hold.

[30] C. Will, "The confrontation between general relativity and experiment," Living Rev. Relativity **17**, 4 (1–117), (2014), `http://www.livingreviews.org/lrr-2014-4`, accessed 2016/04/06.

[31] *Adapted to* essentially means that the accelerated observers are coordinate stationary in the metric.

[32] We may assign an *extended* momentarily comoving inertial frame to each observer, because the spacetime is flat.

[33] We can imagine the energy of any object to be completely converted into photons by bringing it in contact with an identical object made of antimatter. The energy of these photons is twice the energy of the original object. Obviously, the conversion factor between photon energies and other energies must be the same in each frame of reference, otherwise a perpetuum mobile could be constructed by successive conversions to photons and back to matter in different frames.

[34] Ø. Grøn, "Acceleration and weight of extended bodies in the theory of relativity," Am. J. Phys. **45**, 65–79 (1977).

[35] G. Muñoz and P. Jones, "The equivalence principle, uniformly accelerated frames, and the uniform gravitational field," Am. J. Phys. **78**, 377–383 (2010).

[36] G. Rizzi and M. L. Ruggiero, "Space Geometry of Rotating Platforms: An Operational Approach," Found. Phys. **32**, 1525–1556 (2002).

[37] This is true, provided $\tilde{f}(\tilde{r})\tilde{h}(\tilde{r}) + \tilde{k}(\tilde{r})^2 > 0$ and $\tilde{n}(\tilde{r}) > 0$.

[38] This is equivalent to requiring the circumference of a circle about the origin to be given by $2\pi r$.

[39] With the choice $w(y) = \int^y \mathrm{d}x\, \tilde{k}(x)/\tilde{f}(x)c$.

[40] Here, a CSO is an observer satisfying $\mathrm{d}\tilde{r} = \mathrm{d}\vartheta = \mathrm{d}\varphi = 0$.

[41] By that I mean a clock that has been adjusted to run faster or more slowly by a fixed factor than a standard clock, whose rate is that of its proper time (in practice determined via some atomic transition). The clocks of the global positioning system are non-standard clocks. They have been detuned from their proper time so as to run synchronously with ground clocks on the earth.

[42] W. Rindler, *Relativity. Special, general, and cosmological* (Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 2001).

[43] Because we write $\boldsymbol{F}_{\rm loc}$ both for a three-force and a four-force with temporal part zero.

[44] The standard version of Huygens' principle, allowing the reconstruction of a wave front from a set of elementary waves follows from the more elaborate variant given here, but does not imply it. So it is a weaker form.

[45] By causality, it cannot, of course, be influenced by events *outside* the light cone either.

[46] L. Bombelli and S. Sonego, "Relationships between various characterizations of wave tails," J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **27**, 7177–7199 (1994).

[47] D. V. Gal'tsov, "Radiation reaction in various dimensions," Phys. Rev. D **66**, 025016 (1–5), (2002).

[48] That is, it holds for all *even spacetime* dimensions greater than two.

[49] Waves satisfying Huygens' principle will be shape-preserving only, if additional conditions are satisfied (3D space, origin from a point source or a source with spherical symmetry).

[50] There are condensed-matter analogs, such as second-sound, i.e., temperature waves, in liquid helium. Also density oscillations in a liquid behave similar to scalar waves in many respects, even though they are longitudinal, not scalar.

[51] In one space dimension, the existence of undistorted waves is related to conditions with velocity or time-derivative initial data. Via integration by parts the derivative may be shifted over to the Green's function, so the Heaviside function becomes a δ function, and the waveform is just the function multiplying that δ function.

[52] From Eq. (3) we find, setting $\mathrm{d}s^2 = 0$, that photons traveling parallel to the x axis have velocities $\pm\bar{g}x/c$.

[53] Two observers near the equator with angular coordinates differing by 180° will fall in opposite directions.

[54] Moreover, if we imagine our observers to be close to the apex of their free fall, all of them will have small velocities with respect to CSOs, and the spatial coordinates of the static frame will be almost constant in the falling shell frame during the short time interval considered.

[55] The Ricci tensor was calculated via computer algebra, employing the differential geometry package of Maple 17.

[56] K. Kassner, "Spatial geometry of the rotating disk and its non-rotating counterpart," Am. J. Phys. **80**, 772–781 (2012).

[57] K. Kassner, "Ways to resolve Selleri's paradox," Am. J. Phys. **80**, 1061–1066 (2012).

[58] H. Ohanian, "What is the principle of equivalence?" Am. J. Phys. **45**, 903–909 (1977).

[59] A. Almheiri, D. Marolf, J. Polchinski, and J. Sully, "Black holes: complementarity or firewalls?" J. High Energy Phys. **2013**, 1–20 (2013).

[60] B. P. Abbott et al., "Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger," Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 061102 (2016).

[61] On the other hand, the weak form of the equivalence principle was known to Newton already.

[62] W. Rindler, "General relativity before special relativity: An unconventional overview of relativity theory," Am. J. Phys. **62**, 867 (1994).

[63] As noted before, this is not true for the BD theory with its additional scalar field that makes vacuum act, to some extent, like a polarizable medium.

[64] In the question and answers threads of ResearchGate (`http://www.researchgate.net/topics`), extensive discussions of general relativity can be found demonstrating strong interest in how the theory extends its scope beyond special relativity.

[65] ρ can be rescaled by an arbitrary constant factor in the metric without destroying its isotropy, so we might require $\rho \sim \alpha r$ $(\rho \to \infty)$ with some positive constant α instead.

[66] T. Mueller and F. Grave, "Catalogue of Spacetimes," (2010), arXiv:0904.4184v3 [gr-qc].

[67] A. Einstein and N. Rosen, "A Particle Problem in the General Theory of Relativity," Phys. Rev. **48**, 73–77 (1935).